

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/651,305	08/28/2003	Chia-Gee Wang	U 014775-5	9020
140 7	7590 09/22/2006		EXAMINER	
	LADAS & PARRY 26 WEST 61ST STREET NEW YORK, NY 10023	•	GEMBEH, SHIRLEY V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date ___

6) Other: _____.

Application/Control Number: 10/651,305 Page 2

Art Unit: 1614

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-35 are drawn to a method of treating malfunctioning cells in a living mammal comprising (a) administering a compound which is associated with DNA in cell, said compound comprising a pre-selected element (b) irradiating a selected region in which malfunctioning cells having said compound associated with DNA classified in class 600, subclass 476.
- II. Claims 36-84 are drawn to a method of treating tumors or cancer in a living mammal comprising (a) administering a compound which is associated with DNA in cell, said compound comprising a pre-selected element (b) irradiating a selected region in which malfunctioning cells having said compound associated with DNA classified in class 514 subclass 300, also in class 424 subclass 9.4.
- III. Claims 85-99 are drawn to a kit for treating malfunctioning cells in a living mammal comprising (a) administering a compound which is associated with DNA in cell, said compound comprising a pre-selected element (b) irradiating a selected region in which malfunctioning cells having said compound associated with DNA classified in class 378 subclass 65.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the following reasons:

Inventions III and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for

using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (see US 5776925 from IDS 1449), wherein the Texaphyrins are chemosensitisers for enhancing the cytotoxicity of chemotherapeutic agents. Used in treatment of e.g. leukaemia, lymphoma, carcinoma and sarcoma.

Inventions III and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product.

The three inventions are independent and distinct, each from the other as they have acquired separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and separate subject matter for inventive effort. Further a reference, which anticipates any one of the above inventions, would neither anticipate nor make obvious of the other inventions. Each such invention is capable of supporting its own patent. For these reasons, the restriction requirement is proper.

The inventions above are patentably distinct. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. Burden consists not only of specific searching of classes and subclasses, but also of searching

Art Unit: 1614

multiple databases for foreign references and literature searches. Burden also resides in the examination of independent claim sets for clarity, enablement, and double patenting issues. Further, a reference that would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group. Finally, the consideration for patentability is different in each case. Thus, it would be an undue burden to examine all of the above inventions in one application and the restriction for examination purposes as indicated above is deemed proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims

Page 5

and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

Application/Control Number: 10/651,305 Page 6

Art Unit: 1614

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shirley V. Gembeh whose telephone number is 571-272-8504. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 -5:00, Monday- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/651,305

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SVG 9/9/06 ARDIN H. MARSCHEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 7